
Remarks

This is in response to the Examiner's Action mailed January 2, 2004. In that action the Examiner rejected claims 1 through 23, 26, 28 through 35, and 45 through 53. The Examiner allowed claims 24 and 25 and objected to claims 27 and 36 through 44. The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that the claims in the present application are properly rejectable in view of the cited references.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 23, 26, 28 through 35, and 45 through 53 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious in view of United States Patent 5,598,280 ("Nisho *et al.*") in combination with United States Patent 5,448,404 ("Schrenk *et al.*"). The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that the invention, as defined by the present claims, is obvious in view of these references.

In making this rejection, the Examiner states that the Nisho *et al.* patent teaches "a back reflector proximate the back surface of the light guide, the back reflector comprising a multilayer optical film (col. 8, lines 38-52)." The Examiner then goes on to suggest that the Schrenk *et al.* patent teaches a multilayer film "having at least 80% reflectivity." The Examiner concludes that it would be obvious to replace the multilayer film of the Nisho *et al.* patent could be replaced by the mulilayer film of the Schrenk *et al.* reference.

The Examiner's combination of these references fails for a variety of reasons. First, the Nisho *et al.* does not teach a multilayer film as a reflector. The passage cited by the Examiner specifically describes a variety materials deposited on the light guide. Therefore, it is not possible to make the substitution suggested by the Examiner. Second, even if the substitution were to be made, the combination of the references would not teach the limitation that the reflectivity of the material be at least 80% at an angle of 60° to the normal. The Schrenk *et al.* does not teach anything about the angular dependence of reflectivity.



The Examiner further asserts that "it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make Nisho's multilayer film having at least about 99% of the light incident at an angle of 60 degrees from normal because Nishio's multilayer film can increase reflectivity at an angle of 60 degrees from normal by adding more layers on the film." The Examiner provides no support for this statement. However, since the Nisho *et al.*

patent does not teach a multilayer film, it could not be obvious to add more layers to the multilayer film of Nisho *et al.* Moreover, simply adding more layers will not necessarily increase the reflectivity to the claimed values at an angle of 60° to the normal. At such high angles to the normal, it is necessary to control the index of refraction in the z direction as well as in the x and y directions. That is taught by the present application, but not recognized by the prior art.

Because the present invention, as defined by the pending claims, is not obvious in view of the cited references, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of the claims and allow all claims pending in this application.

Respectfully submitted,

3-30-04
Date

By:  
Stephen W. Buckingham, Reg. No.: 30,035
Telephone No.: (651) 733-3379

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833

32692

Customer Number




Patent
Case No.: 51806US008

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor: WORTMAN, DAVID L.
Application No.: 10/051530 Group Art Unit: 2875
Filed: January 22, 2002 Examiner: Guiyoung Lee
Title: BACKLIGHT SYSTEM WITH MULTILAYER OPTICAL FILM
REFLECTOR

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR §

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:	
3-30-04	
Date	Signed by: Kim Elfstrom

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the outstanding Office Action, mailed January 2, 2004, in the above-identified application.

Please charge any fees due, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3723.
One copy of this sheet marked duplicate is also enclosed.

Duplicate